

## REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of June 29, 2005.

Acceptance of the drawings is acknowledged.

Regarding paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, Applicant confirms without traverse election of Species 1, claims 1-3 and 5 through 7. Claim 4 has been withdrawn.

As Examiner well knows from a careful reading of the specification, the present invention provides a pendant display for inwardly pivoting doors that allows normal opening and closing thereof while maintaining the display orientation. Such displays are well suited as described for activities held in rooms wherein mechanical and adhesive mounted signage is not possible. The invention as claimed in combination in amended claim 1 recites an easy to assemble display that may be readily mounted on an inwardly pivoting door and removed without damage upon completion of the activity. Such invention as recited in amended claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by the references cited in the rejection of the claims in paragraph 4.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite more clearly the combination of the door, casing and display wherein the above advantages are provided. This clearly negates Examiner's position in the rejection that such recitations are exemplary and not given patentable weight. The claim recites a support member having a spherical socket wherein the shaft with a ball member is inserted through a vertical aperture into the socket and retained at an integral snap fit means. The shaft is folded from the insertion position to a horizontal position at an upwardly and forwardly opening slot.

The string of four references cited against the original claims is not considered relevant to the current claims. The primary reference to Rumpf

is a check out lane sign. It is intended for mounting only at a fixed vertical surface 23 at a side rail of the counter by adhesive or fasteners (column 2, lines 67-68). The support member of Rumpf is a two-piece construction wherein the body 4 and the base 19 are connected to fixedly capture the ball 11 in the socket formed interior therebetween. There is no vertical aperture as recited permitting snap fit assembly. Contrary to Examiner's position Figure 2 does not show a downwardly extending insertion aperture. Any such movement is blocked by guides 7 and 8. Assembly is possible only through rear insertion into the body 4 and subsequent attachment of the base 5. It is submitted that the recited claim language regarding the support member finds no correspondence in the reference. Regarding the Hawes reference, the same discloses an outwardly pivoting vehicle door. If the Hawes reference were placed on the claimed door combination, inward movement would be prevented by lower standard 22. Regarding Brower, it is intended for use with an open door. If closed inwardly or outwardly with the traction apparatus in place, the tip 43 of the bracket 37 would interfere with casing. It further appears for intended operation that the apparatus is mounted on the interior of an inwardly pivoting door. As such the apparatus would have to be removed for door closure. Regarding Kolvites, the finial 22 is merely decorative (column 3, lines 39-49) and not suggestive of using an enlarged outer end section for retaining a pendant on a horizontal shaft. Accordingly, the pendant display of amended claim 1 recites patentable novelty, which is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that claim 1 and claims 3, 5 and 6 dependent thereon are in proper form for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

MILLS LAW FIRM, PLLC



Peter D. Sachtjen, Reg. No. 24,619

Mills Law Firm, PLLC  
Post Office Box 1245  
Cary, NC 27512  
Telephone: (919) 462-3036  
Facsimile: (919) 462-3041  
Attorney Direct Line: (252) 413-0475